

Sixth, now, as to your final paragraph which I consider an insult to my constituency—if ever there was a threat and, what I would call, blackmail, this is it. And, so that all may see it, I intend to put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for posterity.

As for myself, I have the utmost confidence and respect for the people in my district (as well as the entire country) and am perfectly willing to rest my case in their capable hands.

Yours very truly,

ALBERT H. BOSCH,
Member of Congress.

MR. KHRUSHCHEV'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, possibly it is academic to discuss the pros and cons of the forthcoming visit to this country next month of Soviet Premier Khrushchev. Whether we like it or not, whether we approve of the visit or not, the undeniable fact remains that he has been extended an invitation by President Eisenhower and will arrive here for about a fortnight's stay as an official guest.

I feel, nevertheless, that I must make clear my own strong disagreement with the fact that the invitation was issued. I not only object in principle to extending an invitation of this type to a person who is so completely opposed to our Government and our way of life but I also feel that the visit itself will have serious effects on our foreign policy.

In the first place, a cornerstone of our foreign policy is and has been the liberation of the captive peoples who now exist under communism. It was for this reason that the Congress recently passed the resolution designating Captive Nations Week, for the purpose of encouraging our friends behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains and letting them know that they are not forgotten by the American people. What are they now to think when we receive their slave master in this country as an honored guest? Can they have any other feeling but one of abandonment and desertion?

If I could believe that the Khrushchev visit might succeed in lightening the chains of the captive peoples, Mr. Speaker, I would naturally strongly support it. But has the Russian Premier given any indication that he intends to change Communist policy toward the satellites or for that matter any other facet of Communist policy? And this brings me to my next point of objection. What has Mr. Khrushchev recently said or done that would lead anyone to believe that he, his government, his party, or indeed world communism has had a change of heart in the slightest degree?

I am not only fearful, Mr. Speaker, of the results that this visit may have on the captive peoples but I am perhaps more fearful of the results it may have on our allies throughout the world. Millions of free peoples everywhere look

to us in the final analysis as the great bulwark of the free world against further aggression by the international Communist conspiracy. It will be necessary to give them the most ironclad assurances that we do not and will not contemplate any kind of a deal with the Russian dictator. There must never be any suspicion in the minds of our friends and allies that the tragic history of Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam is about to be repeated or that we are considering a further division of the world into so-called spheres of influence.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am fearful of the possible results of this visit on the American people themselves. Our people naturally long for relief from high taxes, crushing defense expenditures and all the other sacrifices that we are called upon to make during a time of national emergency and for the sake of our national security. What will our people believe when they witness our arch foe received as an honored guest? Will not their natural reaction be that world peace is now just around the corner with an end to huge defense budgets, high taxes and the need to make further and more costly sacrifices. Will the American people continue to believe, after Mr. Khrushchev has left our shores, that the international Communist conspiracy remains just as great a menace as ever? Will we continue to regard communism as grave a threat to our freedom and security as before?

For these and many other reasons, Mr. Speaker, I must frankly say that I deplore the invitation to Mr. Khrushchev and I deeply regret that it was tendered and accepted. But, as I stated earlier, it has been issued, it was accepted, and the visit now seems a fact. That being the case, let us endeavor to put the best possible face on it.

There are two immediate risks in connection with the visit itself. First, there is the risk that the reception of Mr. Khrushchev will be so hospitable that he will gain an erroneous impression of our people and of their determination to resist any threat to our freedom, including that posed by his own government's ideology. Second, there is a real risk in the opposite direction and that is, keeping in mind the events surrounding the Mikoyan visit of last winter, that some incident might occur which would pose either embarrassment to our Government or physical risk to Khrushchev or a combination of both. Those are risks, Mr. Speaker, which should constantly be kept in mind.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the strongest supporters of this visit do not want Mr. Khrushchev to acquire any false impressions of our people or of their true feelings about the Communist movement. I am equally sure that the strongest opponents of the visit, including myself, do not want anything to happen which would embarrass this Government or would create an international incident with all its imaginable consequences. The question, therefore, is where a happy medium can be found.

In a column dated August 6, the distinguished commentator David Lawrence spoke of the constitutional right of the

American people to dissent against Khrushchev's visit, should they desire to do so. I insert the entire text of this article in my remarks at this point, but I desire to read the final two paragraphs, which contain some suggestions as to how those desiring to do so might express their true feelings during the Khrushchev visit in an orderly and peaceful manner:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 6, 1959]

U.S. PEOPLE AND KHRUSHCHEV—CITIZENS' DISSENT AGAINST VISIT BY DICTATOR HELD CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT

(By David Lawrence)

Do the people of the United States really want Nikita Khrushchev to visit this country? President Eisenhower assumes that they do. The Governments of Sweden and other Scandinavian countries recently issued a similar invitation, but the Soviet Premier, after accepting it, decided not to go there because it was evident the people didn't want him to come.

What happened in Sweden between the time the invitation was extended and the announcement that Khrushchev had given up the idea for the present? A letter from Dr. Bela Fabian, written from Geneva a few days ago, tells the story. He is chairman of the Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners and was in Sweden at the time of the planning for the visit of the Soviet Premier. Dr. Fabian writes:

"Naturally Major General Zacharov, Deputy Chief of the Soviet Security Police, knew that the August committees were preparing mass meetings and demonstrations. In Sweden 10 meetings were to be held simultaneously on August 13. The one thing he did not know was whether the Swedish people would demonstrate by ostentatiously staying at home, so that the streets would be empty and there would be no one there except the police, or that there would be enormous crowds who would turn their backs on Khrushchev."

Dr. Fabian writes that the August committees contained a large number of members, among them prominent intellectuals, several Nobel Prize winners, university professors, and writers. Many students organizations were represented.

Already there are varying points of view in this country as to what the reaction of the American people will be in the cities to be visited by Khrushchev. Certainly any disorderly demonstrations would only result in worldwide criticism on the theory that the Americans were not as courteous to the Soviet Premier as the people of the Soviet Union have been toward Vice President Nixon. But inside the United States—unlike the situation in the Soviet Union, where everything is controlled by the Government—the people have a right under the Constitution to speak. They have a right to picket peacefully, if they like, with placards expressing their ideas.

If the Scandinavian plan were put into effect in the United States by boycotting the parades or by viewing in silence the public events where Khrushchev makes his appearance, an orderly protest could be registered.

There may be some in this country who are willing to "let bygones be bygones," but, among the hundreds of thousands of Americans who came here originally from the lands which now are held captive by the Communist dictatorship, there will be no suppression of emotions. Their point of view toward the Moscow autocracy which has ordered the murder or exile of so many innocent people in the last several years is deeply rooted. They cannot forget.

It is true that, after wars are over, friendly feelings toward former enemies often are

developed. But the governments which ruled in Nazi Germany, in militaristic Japan and Fascist Italy have been removed and free governments established. No such change has occurred in Moscow, where the same kind of regime is in power today as the one that broke the pledges given at Yalta in 1945 and at Geneva in 1955.

"Khrushchev's criminal record exceeds all," wrote Dr. L. E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, in a letter to President Eisenhower dated July 31. The Georgetown professor was the originator of the resolution adopted by Congress to proclaim "Captive Nations Week." Expressing the hope that Khrushchev would not be invited to America, Professor Dobriansky added:

"It is patently naive to believe that a visit by the 'hangman of the Ukraine' would add anything to what he already knows about our country. * * * Moral principle alone should dissuade us from conferring respectability and legitimacy to a dedicated enemy, the attributes he desires in order to extend his empire."

There is talk now of arranging a parade of hearses in each American city where Khrushchev appears. On each hearse would be placarded the statistics of the number of persons murdered or exiled from each of the 14 captive countries in recent years. This is one type of orderly demonstration.

Another which is being suggested is that memorial services be held throughout the Nation to carry out the spirit of the resolution in behalf of the captive nations adopted overwhelmingly last month by both Houses of Congress. Nationwide prayers for the liberation of the captive peoples, as well as memorial tributes to the many who have been enslaved or killed by the ruthless Communist dictators, would at least let the rest of the world know that, however polite the Government has to be to any visitor, the people here have the right of free speech. They can express their dissent from the position of their Government, which has invited to free America at this crucial time the man who has threatened war unless the Western forces surrender Berlin and who has never withdrawn that threat.

I have also, Mr. Speaker, discussed this question with high officials of the State Department. In a letter to me dated August 13, Mr. John W. Hanes, Jr., administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the State Department, stated this:

Our experience has been in the past that local authorities—who, after all, are really responsible for the orderly handling of local situations on a trip such as this one—are generally amenable to peaceful demonstrations which they know about well in advance, and which are carried out in a genuinely peaceful and orderly manner and so as not to violate the rights of other citizens who also may be present on a public occasion.

I might add that demonstrations or disturbances which do not meet these criteria not only cause great concern to the security authorities but also tend to create an extremely adverse public reaction against the groups involved on the part of other citizens. Most Americans, as you well know, believe that any guest should be treated at least courteously, whatever they may think of his policies or what he represents.

I am also including, Mr. Speaker, the text of a memorandum regarding various local regulations concerning picketing, demonstrations, et cetera which I have had prepared for my own use and which I wish to insert at this point of my remarks in the RECORD.

The local laws and regulations together with city ordinances should be examined

with respect to the provisions made for or prohibiting picketing, carrying of placards, public behavior, peaceful assembly, etc. Such an examination will establish what can be done within the law.

If this is a local requirement, permits to picket should be obtained in advance, specifying places, numbers, reasons, etc.

Caution should be given to such things as using wooden 2 x 4's, iron pipes and other instruments as standards for placards and banners. Under many local regulations these are deemed dangerous weapons.

Egg-throwing, tomato-throwing, stone-throwing is in most areas prohibited by law.

Under no circumstances should anyone who is engaged in "peaceful picketing" be carrying any type of arm, etc.

Attention should also be paid to the restrictions placed on picketing such as "the pickets must keep moving," "pickets are limited to a particular area," "pickets are limited to a particular number," etc.

Orderly picketing should not be done in such a manner as to interfere with the entrance to and exit from any public or private building, requiring local law enforcement officers to break up the picket line.

Particular attention should be paid to all placards so that there is no obscene language, incitement to riot, etc., which may be prohibited by local ordinances.

In general, the local laws, regulations, ordinances, etc. provide for peaceful assembly and picketing and police protection is afforded to guarantee citizens their rights. The behavior of the pickets, however, has a great bearing on whether the picketing is legal and lawful or illegal and prohibited.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this letter, I want to emphasize that it was sent me at my request. I had earlier advised various departmental officials that I had been approached by certain organizations who sought advice from me as to what they would be permitted to do to register, in a peaceful and orderly manner, their protest at the time of the Khrushchev visit. I therefore presented this problem to the Department and requested to be advised as to what I might say to representatives of these organizations. The Department, of course, is not encouraging such demonstrations and the letter should not be so construed. On the other hand, the Department recognizes, as we all do, that those persons who wish to express their disapproval of Mr. Khrushchev at the time of his visit, without creating a disturbance or infringing upon the rights of others, have a constitutional right to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I have stated that I am strongly opposed to the Khrushchev visit on a personal basis. For my part, I shall endeavor to ignore his presence here. But, since he is evidently coming, I do strongly bespeak for him the courtesy, not hospitality but courtesy, that any foreign visitor is entitled to expect on arriving at our shores. I certainly bespeak that courtesy which we would expect President Eisenhower to receive in Russia on his return visit in October. I would deeply and sincerely regret any untoward incident that might cause our Government embarrassment or worse during his trip. Those people who feel so strongly about his visit that they wish to make a concrete expression of their feelings can find a guideline for doing so in my previous remarks. Beyond this, they should not and they must not go.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I am most anxious that nothing untoward occurs during the Khrushchev visit. I am equally anxious that Mr. Khrushchev receive a correct impression of this country during his travels in our land. At this point, I wish to read some pertinent excerpts from President Eisenhower's press conference of August 12 in which the President dealt, and I think, dealt very well with this very subject:

I want him to see a happy people. I want him to see a free people, doing exactly as they choose, within the limits that they must not transgress the rights of others.

Well, don't we want Mr. Khrushchev to see this country as a freedom-loving place. Why should we worry too much about the fact that people can strike in this town, in this country? I think that this is a shallow kind of thinking.

Now, I will say this. I believe that democracy is the strongest when there are among the different individuals and groups cooperation rather than strife, when there is self-discipline rather than just too intense competition. So the strength would be seen, but only if it is done on a free basis. Because if we are going to do it on a regimented basis, then we are a different type of country than I think we want.

We all have, I think, an obligation to treat the Soviet Premier with those standards of courtesy which are traditionally American and which we expect our President to receive when he visits the Soviet Union. But none of us has any obligation to pretend to like and admire either Mr. Khrushchev or his system of government if we do not. American citizens have the free right of choice in this, as in many other things, and I hope sincerely that we, as a free people, have this freedom of choice and the right to exercise and express it with due regard for the equal rights of our fellow citizens. This may be the most effective lesson which he can learn on this trip. At least I hope so.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the strong and forthright, but very balanced position, taken by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. All of us may have our individual opinions as to the wisdom of a given act at a given time. But, we have to accept situations that exist. Our task now is to decide how best to deal constructively with this one, how to minimize the losses and, if possible, make some gains out of the impending visit of Mr. Khrushchev to this country. We have to admit frankly the negative aspects of the visit and then search out every positive opportunity it presents and take utmost advantage of it.

The losses are undeniable. Extension of the invitation gives Khrushchev three victories: First, it gives him his first objective of respectability as no other thing could possibly do. To some it will imply acceptance by us. It rehabilitates him to some extent without one single deed by him to merit it. It increases his stature; we have come to him. He calls the tune, and we appear to acquiesce.

As the gentleman has well said, we must make clear that our desire for peace and our politeness as a civilized people do not mean that we accept the evil present or wipe out the cruel past in the history of this individual and the regime he represents.

A second objective that the Communists avowedly have had is to divide the United States from its allies, particularly to weaken NATO. Nobody can deny that that has been accomplished to some extent. The glue that holds our alliances together is the confidence of others in the steadfastness of the United States as the leader of the coalition.

A third major objective that they have had all along is to weaken the will to resist of the millions of people behind the Iron Curtain, particularly in the captive nations.

As the gentleman will recall, I served as one of our U.S. delegates to the United Nations General Assembly 2 years ago. Day after day for 3 months I dealt with the Communist delegates of the Soviet Union and its nine satellites. I sat second seat from the Soviet representative, and I negotiated with him officially and on formal, correct, courteous terms. I had no harsh words for him as a person. We traded no personal insults. He was a delegate of his country and I was a delegate of mine, but he knew very well how thoroughly I opposed everything he and his government represented.

When I came back to the Congress I reported that I thought they were operating on about four main convictions:

First, they are not afraid of an attack by the United States. They know we are not going to start a war.

Second, they are genuinely afraid of the peoples under them, the Poznan outbreak and the Hungary revolt the previous year had shaken them to the bottom of their souls.

Third, to win the world, their most immediate need is to break the will to resist of the peoples whom they really fear, the peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

Fourth, how can they do that? They may be able to fool us with smiles, but they cannot fool those peoples. They cannot terrorize those peoples with threats; they have tried it and failed. They cannot trick them as they may be able to trick the peoples of the West. Their best hope of breaking the will to resist of the people behind the Iron Curtain lies in developing a situation which will give them the impression that the United States and the free world are abandoning or are willing to abandon those peoples. If the strong accept the tyrants, how long can the weak be expected to resist? Their maneuver is to try to break the will of the peoples whom they really fear, by weakening our will. We must not let it succeed. The test is a test of our character.

We cannot deny that the confidence those people have had in us has been shaken by the apparent reversal of America's earlier position on a summit conference. And if we pretend a conference by the Big Two is not a summit conference, we deceive no one but ourselves. But the confidence of the captive

peoples in us has not yet been lost. The throngs of deliriously demonstrative people in Poland a week ago Sunday were voting in the only way possible for them against this tyrant and for the kind of free and democratic world which the American Vice President symbolized to them. They have not changed in their views. They are eagerly, almost pathetically, watching to see how we behave now, to see whether we have changed in ours.

Therefore our job is not to argue about what might have been. The major hope that we may be able to turn the visit from possible disaster into substantial gain for freedom and peace is for our Government officials to conduct themselves with such correct and dignified formality, as contrasted with the spontaneously cordial hospitality we instinctively show to genuine friends, and for our people likewise so to conduct themselves that the Communist dictator will know beyond the peradventure of a doubt that the people and the Government of the United States are stronger and firmer and more united in their opposition to everything he or his regime stand for than he has realized.

If we can get that fact across, out of it all can come some good—and the would-be aggressor be given pause.

I congratulate the gentleman for stressing the necessity for polite correctness in our behavior, without the normal outpouring of generous American hospitality, which could understandably be misinterpreted as weakness or softness and gravely increase the danger of his resorting to force which it is our great hope and desire to prevent.

When the Vice President came home from South America he was asked what our policy should be with respect to dictators. He used two phrases. I do not remember them exactly, but something like these:

For dictators we must have formal correctness. For democratic leaders we must have a warm handshake.

Those are indeed, the attitudes that we must maintain. It will require self-restraint and poise and a self-searching on our part to avoid any incident of active hostility that would generate sympathy for him and discredit ourselves; and at the same time to avoid the appearance of being so soft or so desirous of relaxation for ourselves, at whatever cost to the freedom of others, that he might be encouraged to think he can get whatever he wants, and be led to overreach himself with disaster to everyone. We must not let anything whittle away our moral indignation, and therefore our unwavering opposition to the cruel regime we see imposed by this man on hundreds of millions of people, here in the supposedly enlightened 20th century.

*Was it not Lowell who said:

Once to every man and nation comes a moment to decide.

This is such a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his very valuable contribution as always.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan. I think he has stated the point clearly and eloquently. Perhaps the distinguished gentleman from Michigan would be good enough to tell me then if the Committee on Foreign Affairs, since the gentleman from Michigan is a member of that committee, would be willing to go along with the resolution that I introduced here last week urging the President of the United States to take up this whole question of the captive nations, when Mr. Khrushchev does arrive in the United States.

Marguerite Higgins, one of the most distinguished American correspondents wrote the other day from Warsaw that the only really deterring factor in the Soviet plans for the expansion of international communism is the fact that they fear the spirit of freedom among the Poles and all the other peoples in the captive nations. This Joint Resolution 482 was introduced last week in an effort to impress upon the President and to strengthen the President's hand as an expression of the Congress that we feel we have to treat all Soviet foreign policy with a great deal of suspicion so long as those captive nations are denied their freedom.

I believe the resolution is now before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and I would certainly be grateful if both the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY] and the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd], who spoke here so eloquently today, would support this resolution, because I believe it would help the President's hand; it would strengthen his hand when Mr. Khrushchev comes here, to ask for the liberation of these captive nations.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and, speaking merely as a single member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, since I have introduced a resolution markedly similar to that of the gentleman's, I should certainly support both resolutions, which have the same objective.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to commend the gentleman from Michigan for what I think is a very clear, sane, constructive and analytical dissertation on the coming Khrushchev visit to this country.

I was concerned, as apparently the gentleman from Michigan is, about this visit. Certainly I think we have a great responsibility in connection with this visit to see that the Premier of Russia is treated with every possible courtesy by the people in this country, but at the same time I am concerned that we may leave the impression that we are treating him as a top official of a friendly country. I think we have to keep Mr. Khrush-

shchev in his proper category, we must remember who he actually is. He is not only the top official of Communist Russia, he is the world's No. 1 Communist. The Communists, regardless of what anybody may say about them, have never quit, have never deviated from, have never lied about—it is the one thing they have never lied about—their objective so far as this country and the whole free world are concerned. That objective, from which they have never deviated and I submit probably they will never deviate from it, is the ultimate destruction of our democratic system of government in this country and our American way of life.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I was much interested in the remarks of the very able and conscientious gentleman from Michigan. I certainly share his feelings that we can make mistakes when Mr. Khrushchev comes here although I probably regard this visit, and Mr. Eisenhower's visit to Russia, as more of an opportunity to advance the cause of peace than a danger.

I think we do have to take some chances for peace. I think that is what the President sought when he finally concluded this would be a good idea. The gentleman from Minnesota was trying to recall what the Vice President brought back by way of a phrase to cover this situation from Latin America, and it was approximately correct—"A firm handshake and a warm embrace." I think that is the way we deal with people when they are Democrats and people who live by Christian principles. Of course, we give them a warm embrace, but when they are thieves and murderers, as so many of the governments of the dictator nations are today, then we treat them accordingly. But, we have to deal with them and communicate with them. I think this is part of that communication. If we do not communicate with them, if we cut off communication, then there is only one answer and that is a war. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not believe the Nixon visit was successful in creating a better understanding and in causing the people of the Soviet Union to be more of a drag on their government's imperialistic design and whether the gentleman does not believe also, as I do, that the visit of the President of the United States to the Soviet Union may have a similar effect, which may very well aid the cause of peace?

Mr. BENTLEY. I will answer the gentleman from Oregon to this extent. Of course, my knowledge of the Nixon visit and its aftermath is like the gentleman's knowledge, limited entirely to what we have seen in the press and from the accounts that have been received from journalists who accompanied Mr. Nixon on his trip. I would say that I certainly do not believe the Nixon visit

did any harm and it may have done some good. I think it probably convinced a great many people in the Soviet Union who had the opportunity to see and hear Mr. Nixon, either in person or on television, that the leaders of this country really desire peace which, of course, is not in accord with what the Russian Government has been telling their people for a long time. But I point out to the gentleman that I am concerned that it is very possible that the Russian people after 42 years of communism, being indoctrinated in the principles of communism by their Government under their ideological system, even when they are told the truth about our country and even when they see examples of our standard of living such as our exhibition in Moscow, I still think they have certainly a great deal of skepticism and that is why I favor visits on a person-to-person basis because I think the more Soviet people come over here as individuals, as tourists shall we say, they will have a chance to see and learn the true facts about this country and that this will be helpful. With respect to their Government and particularly, Mr. Khrushchev, I am sure that Mr. Khrushchev knows the true facts about this country, but I am just wondering how much of what he sees here will impress him when we keep in mind that he must be seeing everything that he will see in this country through Communist eyes, and even if he is impressed, I wonder whether he will admit it either to himself or to his colleagues.

Mr. PORTER. I wonder if the gentleman would apply his reasoning as to visitor exchanges to China exactly on the same basis?

Mr. BENTLEY. I think the question so far as China is concerned is somewhat academic, I will say to the gentleman. Any visiting has to be reciprocal.

Mr. PORTER. We are having an academic discussion here this afternoon.

Mr. BENTLEY. I understand. But I think the situation insofar as China is concerned is somewhat different, and I do not propose, may I say in all frankness and firmness to my friend, the gentleman from Oregon, to start on a discussion which is so dear to the heart of the gentleman as to what we should do with respect to China at this time.

Mr. PORTER. Then, perhaps, we can go into that discussion at some later time.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Just for the record, I think attention should be called to something that has been torturing my conscience ever since this proposed visit came up. Each of us has stood here in this Chamber and solemnly taken an oath of office. That oath begins as follows:

I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Now it is not a nasty charge on my part to call this man a deadly enemy of our Constitution. He himself has avowed repeatedly that he is; that they

"will bury us." He says that our grandchildren will live under a Communist regime. That could only happen if our Constitution is destroyed—if not in name at least in fact. Therefore, I have taken an oath to defend our Constitution against this very man and the Soviet Government and the world Communist movement which he heads. They are foreign enemies, and they have domestic enemies helping them. The problem is how best to defend and support the Constitution, our whole system of government, against them. How best can we, during this visit, faithfully discharge, as the oath requires, the obligation that we took. I am not suggesting that we approach the problem with a chip on our shoulder, but we must recognize the nature of this cancer as it seeks to eat away our vitals, and we must think out how best to isolate it or cut off its blood supply or reduce its capacity to injure us and others so that the healthy democratic forces all over the world can take heart and work with new confidence and energy to build a world in which we can all be free and secure.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield.

Mr. PORTER. Is the gentleman from Minnesota suggesting that the President is not properly mindful of the oath he took?

Mr. JUDD. I am not suggesting that and the gentleman cannot possibly find any such suggestion in my remarks.

Mr. PORTER. Well, I should hope not.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTLEY. I yield, but first, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes so that the distinguished majority leader may make such comment as he wishes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Mills). There are other special orders, but the Chair will put the request.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to listen to some of these hypothetical questions when the fact remains that we are confronted with a cold, world-killer mind.

If anyone thinks a Communist coming to America is going to change his mind about continuing as a Communist, such as Mr. Khrushchev, he is going to be very sadly mistaken. Since Mr. Khrushchev was invited over here what has happened? We saw North Vietnam threaten Laos. Is that right?

Mr. BENTLEY. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. A few days later we saw Red China threaten Laos and threaten the United States, charging that we were going to give military aid and assistance to Laos. What of it if we were? What is wrong with that?

Then only yesterday or the day before Moscow issued a threat against the United States in connection with Laos. Am I right?

Mr. BENTLEY. The gentleman is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. That threat was issued against the United States after the invitation was extended by the President to Mr. Khrushchev.

I said on the floor the other day that when Peiping issued its threat to the United States it was also a message to Mr. Khrushchev that he had better be careful and recognize the fact that Red China is not a junior partner in the Communist world; and apparently Moscow agrees, because the reasonable inference to draw from Moscow's threat against the United States the other day is that the threat from Peiping has had its effect, and here is Mr. Khrushchev coming over here, a dedicated Communist. He is not going to change his mind; if anything, what he sees in America is going to create in him greater efforts to try and work so that the grandchildren of the President of the United States will be living in a Communist country—as he said in Moscow and as Kozlov before he left this country said in the United States.

So, dream on, my friends, dream on in this world of complacency that is being subtly developed to lull the American people to sleep. If you dream too long it might be too bad for coming generations of Americans, the youngsters of today.

We are meeting a determined enemy whose aim is world revolution and world domination. Let me say that if I have an enemy I am not inviting him into my home. If I know someone is intent upon doing something harmful to me or any member of my family I am not inviting him into my home. I might have to negotiate with him on a business level; as a leader I might have to talk to one or two Members who do not like me, but I do it as leader; I am not inviting him into my home. Negotiate? Yes, but to give an official invitation, taking him into the bosom of our country, there is a marked difference between negotiation and doing that.

And might I say, talking about this gentleman who is coming over here with his record, treat him with respect, yes, but do not make him a hero. There should be no denial of the American right of freedom of speech and freedom of action; and, above all, while we should treat him with respect we should not impair our freedom of speech, and over and above that we should not treat him as a hero.

Mr. BENTLEY. I completely agree with the majority leader and appreciate his contribution very much.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when my special order is called I may be permitted to extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ANSWER TO THE QUESTION: "WHO WRITES OUR LAWS?"

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from

Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question "Who Writes Our Laws?" was given when, a week ago tomorrow, the House passed S. 1555, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, Monday, July 27, at a time when a comparatively few labor leaders were trying to dictate Federal legislation, I asked that question. We were given the answer when the House, by a 28-vote majority, substituted the Landrum-Griffin bill for the Kennedy-Ervin bill, and again the next day, when Members, given the opportunity by my demand for a reading of an engrossed copy of the bill, to think it over, gave the same measure a majority of 178—a gain of 150 votes.

Publicity given the McClellan hearings and a more complete knowledge of the misuse of union funds, as well as of organized violence and of the denial of natural and constitutional rights to not only businessmen, nonunion workers, but to union members themselves, caused the home folks, including many union members, to write their Representatives.

The result was the substitution of a bill, sponsored by—but not written by—the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], for the Kennedy-Ervin bill, the Senate bill. The House bill, under our practice, has gone to conference under the Kennedy-Ervin name and number, and many people seem to be fearful that we will not get what the people demanded—are now demanding—that is, fair, just, remedial legislation—legislation which will give protection to the funds of the union members, protect the rights of the nonunion worker, and more important, the health, welfare and prosperity of our people as a whole, without in any way hurting legitimate union activities.

To the "doubting Thomases," I can only say, "O ye of little faith."

It has long been my conviction that, ultimately, when the people learned the facts, Congress would be forced to write remedial legislation. That thought was in my mind when I asked for a reading of an engrossed copy of the bill, for, when "the people" speak, the legislators listen.

That maneuver gave the Congressmen an overnight opportunity to consider what they were doing, and I had no doubt of the result. The result was that the majority for the more effective bill jumped from a miserly 28 to a generous 178.

It goes to prove that, at least occasionally, the average, ordinary legislator in touch with his people, who believe in decency, who believe in just, fair treatment for all, can be as accurate a political prophet as the professional, so-called smart politician.

For months it has been my opinion that if publicity was given to the arbitrary and criminal activities of a very few labor leaders, as disclosed by the McClellan committee, the Congress would be forced to write the kind of legislation the people deserved, were demanding.

The vote so far has proved, and, in my judgment, the final result will once again prove, that our people are not only honest, believe in justice, but that, once they know the facts, they will insist that legislation tending to prevent the abuse of legislation designed to protect labor shall be enacted.

In answer to my question, "Who writes our laws?" we now have the answer: The people's representatives write the laws when the people take cognizance of what is happening and tell their hired men—Congressmen—what they want.

Mr. Speaker, a word on another subject.

POLITICAL LIQUIDATION DOES NOT ALWAYS WORK IN THIS COUNTRY

Mr. Speaker, today, under date of August 18, 1959, Members received a communication from James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organization.

One letter of praise went to those who had opposed the substitution of the Landrum-Griffin bill for the Elliott bill, which, in substance, was the Kennedy-Ervin bill sent over by the Senate.

Another letter from the same gentleman went to those who had voted for the substitution of the Landrum-Griffin bill for the Elliott bill.

The letter I received reads as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Only you know, in the privacy of your own conscience, whether you carefully considered the possible consequences of the Landrum-Griffin bill when you voted for it on August 13, 1959. If you did, and realized that it is a punitive, repressive measure intended to weaken all labor unions and thereby all working men and women, you have much to answer for. If you did not, and merely yielded to the pressures of the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, your guilt is perhaps even greater.

You should realize now, if you did not during the heat of battle, that this vindictive assault on the labor movement will, in the long run, prove to your constituents that you are less interested in individual rights and democracy than in property rights and the concentration of power in the hands of big business.

You may believe that you are safe in such action because organized labor is relatively weak in your district, and cannot call you to account for the damage you have sought to do to it. You may be right—at the moment.

We wish to assure you, however, that we shall do all in our power to prove to the working men and women in your district that you have cast your lot against them and they should therefore take appropriate action at the ballot box.

Very truly yours,

JAMES B. CAREY.

My decision was not made—my vote was not cast—because of any argument or because of any pressure exerted either by the chamber of commerce or the National Association of Manufacturers.

For more than 20 years, I have been talking and voting for legislation which would protect the union man from his corrupt bosses—when he had such—which would protect the nonunion worker—and for the protection of the public health, welfare, and security of our people as a whole.

If there is any similarity in the views held, or the legislation desired by those two organizations—and the Member from the Fourth District of Michigan—it can truthfully be said that the Member from Michigan was the pioneer in advocating the type of legislation adopted on the 14th of August by the House.

A perusal of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a reading of the literature of the two organizations to which reference has just been made, demonstrates the truth of my statement.

Long, long ago, gentlemen in positions similar to that now held by Mr. Carey—with whom, years ago, over the radio I discussed some of the issues carried in the bill adopted by the House—and with political power and financial resources, supported my primary opponents and my opponents at the general election.

Fortunately for my political security, my views were similar to those held by a majority of the people of the Fourth District of Michigan.

As a special writer assigned to my district to report to the voters of the State my political views—a writer for, as I recall, a Detroit organization—stated that, when I spoke in the House, the people did not hear the voice of CLARE E. HOFFMAN—the voice they heard was the voice of the people of his district—the finest compliment (at least in my judgment) that could be paid a Congressman.

That at the request of those representing special interest groups, the people of the Fourth District, who do their own thinking, do not—and in my judgment, will not—politically liquidate any candidate for Congress—or, for that matter, any candidate for State office—is evidenced by news stories and editorials, a very few of which read as follows:

[From the Niles Daily Star, Aug. 8, 1959]
CHICKENS COME HOME TO ROOST

President Eisenhower took to the airways Thursday night to focus public attention on his recommendations for a so-called "strong" labor bill.

Favored by the President is the Landrum-Griffin bill, the same one recommended in this column in Thursday's Niles Daily Star. It includes provisions to deal with the "blackmail" and "secondary boycott" techniques used by unscrupulous union organizers who attempt to force their demands against both worker and employers.

Neither of these practices are covered in bills reported out of the Senate and House by committees of those respective bodies. The Landrum-Griffin bill also gives union members much greater latitude in expressing their personal views without fear of retribution from those of the union heads who rule their union's affairs and the union membership with an iron hand.

For 10 years there has been virtually no new Federal labor legislation, primarily because it has been such a hot subject and because many Members of Congress have been highly susceptible to organized pressures.

It is doubtful if right now there would be anything more than lip service to such legislation except for the rotten state of affairs in a few powerful unions which were uncovered by 2 years of hearings by the Senate Labor Rackets Committee.

In this connection, it is interesting to recall that Michigan's Fourth District Con-

gressman CLARE E. HOFFMAN introduced bills in Congress, more than 20 years ago, aimed at some of the abuses which have since developed.

Those bills were written back in 1937, only a short time after the notorious Flint sit-down strike in which strike leaders openly defied authorities, resulting in death, widespread personal injury and tremendous destruction of property. The Flint technique spread to many other parts of the Nation with similarly tragic consequences.

It was with a view toward controlling these unbridled demonstrations of lawlessness, together with the need for protecting the interests of workers who wished to have no part in such incidents, that Mr. Hoffman introduced his bills in 1937. But they didn't stand a chance of passage because the majority Members of Congress were afraid of their own political necks.

Largely because of this lack of legislation, a few labor leaders have gradually wormed themselves into positions where they exert a life-and-death control over their members and have also been enabled to divert millions of dollars of union dues and welfare funds for their own selfish purposes.

It is doubtful if any situation in recent years has provided a more fitting application for that old adage, "Chickens come home to roost."

[From the News-Palladium, Aug. 11, 1959]
THE PEOPLE SPEAK

Fourth District Congressman CLARE E. HOFFMAN reported to the News-Palladium Monday, from Washington, that he is being deluged with letters and cards from his constituents, urging him to keep fighting for a labor reform bill aimed at driving union racketeers, double-dealers, and crooks out of business and guaranteeing the union rank-and-file members their rights as freemen.

Those who have followed Mr. Hoffman's career of over 20 years in Congress know that he favors and supports honest labor unions as a necessity. Contrary to interpretations of his political enemies and certain union officials, Representative HOFFMAN is not now and never has been antilabor.

That this truth is recognized by the great majority, in and out of the unions, is proved by his habit of winning hands down, in every election.

The Congressman told us that his mail supporting his efforts, has and is coming from people in every walk of life. Workers and their wives have written him in commendation. So have professional people and others.

It has dawned upon Americans everywhere that the greatest enemy of the honest labor movement is the goons and grafters who are motivated by personal greed for money and lust for power. Union reform is something beyond partisan politics—it is a question of the survival of freedom.

We are pleased to note Congressman HOFFMAN's cautious optimism on the outcome of labor legislation. This is the week of decision in the National Capital. We can be assured that fighting CLARE will be in there, doing his all in the cause of peace and progress.

[From the Sturgis Daily Journal, Aug. 11, 1959]

HOFFMAN NO "JOHNNY-COME-LATELY" IN FIGHT FOR LABOR REFORM LAWS
(By Hale Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—Tough and peppery CLARE HOFFMAN first proposed in 1937 that Congress enact reform legislation to clean up corrupt labor unions and drive out racketeers.

The veteran Michigan Congressman followed this up in 1939 and 1941 by introducing almost identical House bills. Each time his colleagues gave these "radical proposals" quiet burial.

Last Wednesday, in the super-charged atmosphere of current events, the 83-year-old HOFFMAN reintroduced a similar bill with hardly a comma changed.

The outspoken Republican veteran, who in the intervening years, has introduced 136 different pieces of labor legislation, reflects, wonders, and remarks:

AT EVERY OPPORTUNITY

"Something that I advocated 22 years ago now is suddenly popular. What bothers me is that now I'm getting letters and telephone calls urging me to vote for a tough labor bill. Of course I will. I've been for that all along. I didn't think anyone would be surprised to learn it now."

When House Members begin assembling around noon for meetings of the House, the wiry HOFFMAN generally is already there, waiting.

For the past 3 weeks, he has taken the floor at every opportunity to speak on the need for labor reform legislation, hammering away on this subject regardless of the topic up to debate.

When the House debated foreign aid, HOFFMAN rose to speak on labor; when it considered a home rule proposal for the District of Columbia, HOFFMAN slipped in a blast against UAW President Walter Reuther as a man "trained in organized violence"; when the Inter-American Bank bill was before the House, he charged Teamsters Boss James Hoffa was a "greedy" leader with "unbridled ambition" who misused union welfare funds.

FEW WHO ARE CROOKED

"I'll talk on something when no one else does," HOFFMAN said. "Some Members think it is unpopular to oppose labor leaders; afraid they'll lose votes. But basically they're wrong."

HOFFMAN, who hails from the relatively well unionized Fourth District of Michigan, is quick to explain he is not opposed to the labor union movement.

"I'm for organized labor, of course, always have been," he said. "I'm just against those few who are crooked. I never asked for anything that would hurt a union working man—never."

HOFFMAN was chairman of congressional investigating groups which in 1947-48 and again in 1953-54 exposed instances of racketeering and strong-arm organizing tactics. The inquiries led to more than 12 criminal convictions of corrupt labor leaders.

MIGHT RAISE ISSUE

As far back as 1936 when sitdown strikes were fashionable, and in 1941 when Ford Motor Co. experienced a bloody, death-marred strike, HOFFMAN went to Detroit and other cities to observe these and other labor-management violence first hand.

HOFFMAN's 1937 reform bill has many of the features of the "modern legislation" now pending in the House. It includes a provision for a secret ballot and a requirement that unions file complete financial reports of every dollar taken in and spent.

He fears chances of passing "sound, equitable legislation" could be damaged if "the boys start playing politics."

He said President Eisenhower's recent nationwide TV-radio appearance backing a strong reform measure "might tend to raise the political issue. Maybe not, we'll see."

Asked if Congress will pass a reform bill this year, HOFFMAN paused and replied: "We'll get something. The House will pass a bill which the labor boys will call stringent. But for me, I'd call it mild. But I'm not predicting what the Senate will do."

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD]

THE WORKER'S FRIEND

Mr. Gross. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention at this time to an editorial in yester-